

**INDEX TO
EVIDENTIARY HEARING TRANSCRIPTS
RAYMOND GASTIL
CROSS-EXAMINATION: PAGES 90-164**

NOT A PSYCHOLOGIST

- NO DEGREES IN PSYCHOLOGY93, LINES 14
- NOT LICENSED IN PSYCHOLOGY94, LINES 3
- NO PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS94, LINES 12
- NOT A PSYCHOLOGIST163, LINE 23

GASTIL’S THEORY CAN’T PREDICT INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR

- STATES HIS THEORY CAN BE USED TO PREDICT A FACTOR OF
INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR, BUT NOT TO PREDICT AN INDIVIDUAL’S
BEHAVIOR150, LINE 20
- “I COULD NOT ON THE BASIS OF THE SOUTHERN THEORY OF VIOLENCE
PREDICT THAT ANGELO FEARS WAS GOING TO HARM SOMEBODY ON A
PARTICULAR DAY.” 151, LINE 1
- AGREES HIS THEORY CAN’T PREDICT HOW AN INDIVIDUAL WILL
BEHAVE.....152, LINE 24
- AGREES HIS THEORY CAN BE USED TO DISCUSS EPIDEMIOLOGY OF
CRIME, BUT CAN’T BE USED TO PREDICT INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR.....153, LINE 13

BASIS FOR HIS WORK

- ONLY FACTUAL BASIS IS HISTORICAL ANECTDOES FROM FRANKLIN
AND HOPE, EMPIRICAL BASIS OF BREARLEY, AND CRIME STATS FOR
1964.....113, LINE 22
- HOPE – PUBLISHED IN 1956.....101, LINE 16
- REDFIELD – PUBLISHED IN 1880103, LINE 22
- REDFIELD DIDN’T HAVE STATS FROM BUREAU OF JUSTICE; JUST RELIED
ON NEWSPAPER ARTICLES104, LINE 18
- NEWSPAPER ARTICLES DON’T FULLY REPORT HOMICIDES, ESPECIALLY

- IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY 105, LINE 8
- BREARLEY – PUBLISHED IN 1932108, LINE 14
- BREARLEY ONLY HAD HOMICIDE STATS FOR 24 STATES FOR THE YEARS
1920 AND 1925109, LINE 16

CRITICISM OF HIS WORK

- ARTICLE “HOMICIDE AND A REGIONAL CULTURE OF VIOLENCE” WAS
CRITICIZED IN THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW 127, LINE 9

(1) LOFTIN AND HILL

- CRITICIZED GASTIL’S METHODOLOGY TO ARRIVE AT SOUTHERN
CULTURE OF VIOLENCE HYPOTHESIS127, LINE 23
- FOUND GASTIL’S ESTIMATES BASED ON POOR MEASUREMENT AND ARE
BIASED129, LINE 10
- HYPOTHESIS IS LOGICALLY UNTESTABLE129, LINE 18
- FOUND INDEX TO BE A MEASURE OF REGION, NOT CULTURE.....130, LINE 20
- GASTIL FAILED TO CITE SPECIFIC DATA SOURCES130, LINE 25
- FINDINGS ARE “LARGELY AN ARTIFACT OF MEASUREMENT,
PROCEDURES USED AND OF THE INADEQUATE SPECIFICATION OF THE
FORM OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SITUATIONAL VARIABLES AND
HOMICIDES.” 131, LINE 6
- CONCLUDED THE EFFECT OF THE INDEX AND GASTIL’S FORMULATION
WASN’T DIFFERENT FROM ZERO IN THEIR ANALYSIS.....132, LINE 13

(2) ERLANGER

- CRITICAL OF GASTIL’S CONCLUSIONS AND HIS LIMITATION OF
VIOLENCE TO LETHAL VIOLENCE133, LINE 14
- POSSIBLE THAT PSYCHOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES ARE IMPORTANT139, LINE 16

(3) DOERNER

- LOFTIN/HILL ARTICLE CONVINCINGLY DAMAGES GASTIL ARGUMENT 142, LINE 2
- “GASTIL PROVIDES NIETHER A CONVINCING THEORETICAL NOR

EMPIRICAL ARGUMENT SUPPORTIVE OF HIS LETHAL VIOLENCE CONCEPT”	143, LINE 3
▪ GASTIL’S OWN STATISTICAL ANALYSIS UNDERMINES THE USE OF THE CONCEPT OF LETHAL VIOLENCE AS THE MARK OF HIS SUBCULTURE PERSPECTIVE	143, LINE 11
▪ HIGH ZERO CORRELATION BETWEEN STATE HOMICIDE RATES AND HOSPITAL BEDS MAY BE INDICATIVE THAT LETHAL VIOLENCE IS MORE A FUNCTION OF MEDICAL SERVICES DEPRIVATION THAN SUBCULTURE VALUES	143, LINE 14
▪ CRITICAL OF GASTIL’S SOLE RELIANCE ON THE 1960 HOMICIDE RATES	146, LINE 2
▪ GASTIL BORDERS ON COMMITTING ECOLOGICAL FALLACY	146, LINE 17